

(a) a Type I TNF receptor comprising the sequence of amino acids 3-163 of SEQ ID NO:1;

(b) the extracellular domain of a Type II TNF receptor,

(c) a chimeric antibody comprising a Type I TNF receptor according to (a) fused to the constant domain of an immunoglobulin molecule; and

(d) a chimeric antibody comprising a Type II TNF receptor according to (b) fused to the constant domain of an immunoglobulin molecule.

12. (New) A method for treating arthritis according to claim 11, wherein the therapeutically effective amount is from about 0.1 mg/kg/week to about 100 mg/kg/week.

13. (New) A method for treating arthritis in a mammal according to claim 11, wherein such mammal is a human.

Claim 3, line 1, change "claim 2" to --claim 10--.

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the comments below is respectfully requested. A Petition for a Three Month Extension of Time accompanies this Amendment and extends the period for response from February 24, 1996 to May 24, 1996.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are canceled and new claims 10-13 are added to more distinctly and more particularly define what applicants claim as their invention. Claims 3 and 10-13 are pending. Claim 10 is an independent claim and recites a method for inhibiting TNF activity in a mammal. Claim 11 recites a method for treating arthritis in a mammal.

On May 9, 1996 applicants' representative, Mr. Malaska, met with Examiner Nisbet and Ms. Knode to discuss the outstanding issues in this application. Applicants thank Examiner Nisbet and Ms. Knode for the courtesy extended to Mr. Malaska during the visit. Applicants will address each issue presented in the outstanding office action in the order it is presented therein.

I. THE SPECIFICATION PROVIDES A DISCLOSURE SUFFICIENT TO ENABLE ONE OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART TO MAKE AND USE THE CLAIMED INVENTION.

At the outset, applicants incorporate by reference all arguments presented in previous amendments and responses that relate to the fact that the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is reading certain language into applicants' specification that does not actually exist.

It appears from the Office Action dated November 24, 1995 (the "Action") that the USPTO believes "the disclosure is considered sufficient only for C-terminal deletions up to amino acid 142." Applicants disagree based on arguments presented previously. However, in